

In July of this year I took, in the neighbourhood of Bovey Tracey, South Devon, in grass traps in the runs of the ant *A. fuliginosus*, many specimens of a *Cartodere* which seemed to me to differ from *elongata*. I sent some examples to Mr. Donisthorpe who forwarded them to Col. Deville for his opinion. Col. Deville says that they are undoubtedly *separanda*, Reitt., and he quotes the following from a table of the species of *Cartodere* given by J. M. Belon in *Revue d'Entomologie*, Caen. 16, 138, 1897:—

1. Coleoptera paulo ante apicatem declivitatem subrotundatum elevato gibbosa. Intervallum quartum basi tantum, quintum a medio saltem ad apice carinatum . . . *elongata*, Curt.
- 1¹. Coleoptera paulo anti apicatem declivitatem magis abruptum a fere verticalem in gibbum subdentiformem elevata. Solum intervallum quintum carinatum . . . *separanda*, Reitt.

This species strongly resembles *elongata* but in addition to the differences mentioned above the elytra seem to be proportionally rather narrower and longer, the legs are a little more slender and the punctuation of the head, especially beyond the eyes, is not so confluent as in *elongata*.

Since my captures Mr. Donisthorpe tells me that he has taken the species abundantly in bones put down as a trap in Windsor Forest.

In my experience *elongata* is generally taken singly usually in fungus, but from the above records *separanda* seems to be rather gregarious in its habits. It will probably be found to be mixed with *elongata* in British collections. Previously it seems to have been recorded only from southern Europe.

**According to the Rules of Nomenclature the name of
Argynnis adippe is of Rottemburg (nec L.), and that of
Melitaea dictynna, Esp., must be replaced by diamina, Lang.**

By ROGER VERITY, M.D.

Mr. Turner has very kindly looked up some data for me in this connection, and he had done it before the remark on "the wretched homonym rule of the Zoologists" was published at page 78 of the present volume, so that the Editors know this paper is not meant as a counteraction. I am glad, however, it affords me an occasion to point out at once that, far from increasing the necessary changes of names, the rule of "primary homonymy" does away with all unforeseeable changes of the future, which the splitting up of genera would bring about, if, each time species were separated generically, one were obliged to take up again the older names, which had been discarded because they were homonyms in the broader genus. In some cases this rule may bring about some unnecessary changes, from a practical point of view, but these little sacrifices must be made in order to attain a uniform result and the sooner all set to work according to discipline, the sooner revisions will be done away with and final stability established. It is comforting to note that the rule of primary homonymy preserves several familiar names of butterflies, which the authors of the beginning of this century had found it necessary to alter according to the rule of

priority. They had discovered that in quite a number of cases an older name existed than the one in use. What had done it was that the very earliest zoologists had discarded the former when all the butterflies belonged to the single genus *Papilio* or a little later, when it had only been split into very few genera, because at that time those names were homonyms of others within the same genus. The application of the rule of priority, now the genera are very much more restricted and numerous, would have obliged one to alter, for instance, *Erebia aethiops*, Esp., to *medea*, Schiff., and in the *Lycaenidi*: *agestis*, Schiff., or *astrarche*, Berg., to *wedon*, Hufn., *bellargus*, Rott., to *thetis*, Rott., *baton*, Berg., to *hylas*, Schiff., and *argyrognomon*, Berg., to *idas*, L. All these older names, however, were homonyms in the single genus *Papilio*, to which they belonged when they were erected, each having already previously being used in it for another species. The rule of primary homonymy thus comes in and condemns them never to be used again, avoiding all the changes which would have been necessary if they had been subsequently revived in the later genera. These results are so satisfactory and so numerous that, if the rule cuts the other way, now and then, and leads to a change of name, we can well make these sacrifices to it.

As to the particular case of *cydippe* and *adippe*, which has suggested the remarks of our Editors, it is a little problem of its own. It is many years I have been puzzling over it and I have dealt with it in the *Linnean Society's Journal—Zoology* of 1913, p. 128, and in the *Bull. Soc. Ent. France*, 1929, p. 277, but it is only now I have struck a solution, which I believe is the correct one and which is a happy one, as it preserves the name in use since a century and a half and it is at the same time strictly in keeping with the International Rules of Nomenclature. In those two papers I have pointed out that Linnaeus has never distinguished and evidently never even seen the species, which is attributed to him under the names of *cydippe* or *adippe*. The specimen he has left, labelled in his own handwriting "*cydippe*," is a female of *niobe* with a very complete set of silver spots on the underside, exactly agreeing in number and in position with those he describes at length, showing that it was the very specimen he had before him. He gives no other distinguishing feature and he himself adds it might simply be the other sex of *niobe*, described by him as having no silver spots. His name of *cydippe* is thus nothing more than the first one ever given to an individual form of a butterfly and, accordingly, neither it nor that of *adippe*, with which Linnaeus substituted it later, when he discovered he had already used it for an oriental species (a *Cethosia* of our times), have, nowadays, any status, because the modern International Rules do not recognise individual forms. The result is that the name *adippe* was perfectly available for any species or subspecies, as though it had never appeared in the literature of the lepidoptera, and when in 1775 Rottenburg and Schiffermüller really detected the existence of the near ally of *niobe* as a distinct species and used the name of *adippe* for it, it is they who erected this name for the first time and are the real authors of it, Rottenburg having precedence over Schiffermüller, according to Prout's suggestion in cases of this sort, as I will presently mention again.

One can thus go on using the name of *adippe* and all one need do is to change its author from Linnaeus to Rottenburg. The latter in his

original description in *Der Naturforscher*, VI., p. 12, distinguishes it specifically from *niobe* chiefly on the strength of "its underside ground-colour being more yellow and the black veins and transverse streaks entirely lacking," adding that one can perceive perfectly it is, in general looks, different from *niobe*, although it is difficult to put the differences in words. This is very much the impression most of us have in the case of some races of these species. Rottemburg's words, few as they are, fix the nominotypical form very exactly as the one in which the underside pattern is extremely reduced, the yellow ground-colour being broadly uncovered. It is the one figured by Bergstrasser from the County of Hanau under the name of *phryca*, which, according to the view I have just given, is an exact synonym of *adippe*, Rott. This form is quite racial in some localities and presumably in the drier ones: the fulvous of the upperside is of a light tinge and the black spots of small size. The name of *baiwarica*, Spuler, thus holds good for the race with the underside broadly suffused with russet, chiefly found in the Tyrol and in the eastern Alps generally, and that of *vulgoadippe*, Vrtý., *Bull. Soc. Ent France*, 1929, p. 279, for the race with the underside exhibiting broad patches of russet and of green in about equal quantities, which I have described from the New Forest, in England, but which is the prevalent one from Sweden to the Pyrenees and to Austria: it is of a richer tone of colour also on the upperside and the black spotting is broader than in the nominotypical form. The latter's original locality can be considered Berlin, as Rottemburg was dealing with Hufnagel's List of butterflies of this locality, when describing it, but it is found as an individual form and as a local race all over the area of *vulgoadippe*.

The other nomenclatorial question I must deal with does not afford as happy a solution as the preceding one, because there seems to be no way of avoiding the sacrifice of the well known name of *Melitaea dictynna*, Esp. to the Rule of primary homonymy.

The name of *dictynna* was first used in the genus *Papilio* of those days by Schiffermüller. Its validity is unquestionable in the first place because it is accompanied by a description ("The orange coloured butterfly, posteriorly eyed on the underside") and then because it has always been admitted that Schiffermüller's very old book must be regarded as a case of its own and his names considered valid even in some particular cases in which he actually gave no description at all, such as that of *Melitaea trivialis*. What has led to this is that Fabricius in 1784 took a journey to Vienna to study Schiffermüller's "types" and drew out short, but very exact and clear descriptions of all these insects. Subsequently Toussaint von Charpentier did the same and quoted, in most cases, the figures of Hübner which represent those species; he was followed by Zincken, surnamed Sommer, by Treitschke, by Fischer and by others, who all established Schiffermüller's species most exactly, so that there would be no sense in discarding some of his names now as "nomina nuda." Nevertheless his *dictynna* falls specifically as a synonym of *Argynnis ino*, Rott., described in 1775 and thus having the right of priority, according to Prout's ingenious suggestion that all names published during that year should have precedence over Schiffermüller's and all those published in 1776 should fall before his, owing to a few copies, one of which is in my possession, bearing a woodcut titlepage with the title of: "*Ankündigung eines systematischen*

Werks von den Schmett. der Wienergegend," and the date of 1775, instead of the usual one of 1776. The name of *dictynna*, Schiff. thus has a status and, although it is an absolute synonym of *ino*, Rott., because the latter's original figure exactly represents the individual form which is prevalent at Vienna, with rather a broad black marginal band on the upperside and a purple suffusion of a deep tinge on the underside, it does away with the possibility of using Esper's homonym, erected under the same generic name of *Papilio*.

Looking over Ochseneimer's very complete old bibliographical references I find that Lang furnishes us since 1782-89 with the substitute of *DIAMINA*, in his *Verzeichniss seiner Schmetterlinge*, p. 44. This has been entirely neglected by Kirby, by Staudinger and in all the synonymic lists I have consulted. Lang gives no description, but simply gives, after the name, the reference: "Ernst., pl. LXII., fig. 31 bis. *Le Damier sixième Espèce*." Ernst., on the other hand, gave no name, but referred to Esper, p. 382, i.e., to *dictynna* Esp. (1777). The result is that Lang names Ernst's description and in consequence actually renames Esper's *dictynna* of 1777, of which he possessed examples from near Augsburg. As Esper's name must fall, owing to its being a primary homonym, Lang's substitute is just what one requires and it has the advantage of applying to the same noninotypical race, so that nothing else need be altered.

Description of the larva of *Specropia* sp.nov.

By CAPT. K. J. HAYWARD, F.E.S., F.R.G.S.

Length 34 mm.

Head and thoracic plate black, the latter with a white dividing line dorsally and the head with short white hairs.

Body black and, with the exception of a band low down laterally and the dorsal portion of the 11th segment, is closely covered with small irregular yellow spots. The black lateral area bordered above with a light yellow line. Tubercles khaki and very prominent. Beneath dark honey brown with traces of the yellow spotting.

The tubercles are as follows.—

First thoracic with supra- and sub-spiracular and a lateral. Second and third thoracics with a ring of five on the forward part of the segment and subspiraculars iv. and v. and a small lateral. Abdominals one to six with anterior and posterior trapezoidals, supra-, post-, and sub-, spiraculars, and a lateral, whilst on the segments 1 and 2 there is a marginal very low down and almost in line with the legs. Segment seven the same but without the postspiracular, there being both subspiraculars iv. and v. Segment eight the same as seven, and nine with the anterior and posterior trapezoidals, a subspiracular and a lateral. The lateral tubercles are small and whitish and the marginal very small and yellowish khaki.

Specimens of the larva in spirit sent to the B.M. Nat. Hist. under No. 7040 and the bred imagines under No. 7019. The pupae and cocoons under No. 7041.

Larvae pupated the 23rd of February, emerging March the 13th.

Larva on *Smilax asumptionis*, A.D. (*Liliaceae*), locally known as "Zarza blanca."